

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**REVIEW PETITION (L) NO. 45 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 1740 OF 2016**

UTI Mutual Fund	}	Petitioner
versus		
The State of Maharashtra	}	
and Ors.	}	Respondents

Ms. Nikita Badheka i/b. Mr. M. M. Vaidya
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dushyant Kumar - AGP for
respondent nos. 1 to 4 (State).

**CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
DR. SHALINI PHANSALKAR-JOSHI, JJ.**

DATED :- OCTOBER 4, 2016

P.C. :- (In Chamber)

1. Heard both sides.

2. This is essentially an application for clarification, though styled as a review petition. Having perused it carefully and in the light of the earlier order, which has been referred in the proceedings, we modify the order under review. We clarify that the percentage of the sum, which has to be deposited, shall be construed as 50% of the tax demand. The words "50% of the tax demand" shall appear in the order and are substituted in the place of the original words "50% of the demand".

3. The order under review, therefore, stands modified accordingly.

4. At the request of Ms. Badheka, the time to comply with the direction in our order, insofar as furnishing of an undertaking, is concerned, stands extended by a period of two weeks from today.

5. Except this modification, no other error or ambiguity is pointed out warranting correction or clarification of the order. The application/review petition is disposed of.

(DR. SHALINI PHANSALKAR-JOSHI, J.) (S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)

Bombay